

### **REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Upon entry of the present amendment claims 11,12, 17 and 18 are pending in the present application. Claims 7-10 and 13-16 have been cancelled. Claims 11, 12, 17 and 18 have been amended.

#### ***Objections to the Drawings***

The Office objects to the proposed drawings filed on 01-23-03 because the display device is driven by an external driver as shown in Figure 1. Additionally, the Office requests a functional label for box 9. A replacement sheet for Figure 1 is attached hereto depicting the driver as internal to the display device and including a label of "phase generator" on box 9. The amendment to the specification is to provide required support in the specification for the changes to Fig. 1.

#### ***Claim Objections***

The Office objects to claim 18 because it depends from itself. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 17.

The Office also objects to claims 12 and 18 because the recitation "said second phase" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 12 and 18 have been amended to depend upon claims 11 and 17, respectively. Claims 11 and 17 set forth a second phase.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office rejects claims 7-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 7-10 and 13-16 have been cancelled and claims 11-12 and 17-18 have been amended.

The Office asserts that the phrase "to effect adaptive control" was unclear as to how the phase generator is adjusted to control the plurality of phases. Claims 11 and 17 have been amended, and recite in relevant part *"...a charge pump, which includes a plurality of stages, wherein signals from each of said plurality of stages are fed back to said phase generator to affect adaptive control of a plurality of phases of said plurality of stages by indicating that corresponding edges of the plurality of phases have terminated..."*

It is respectfully submitted phrase is clear as these claim clearly set forth how the phase generator is adjusted to control the plurality of phases.

The Office rejected claims 10 and 16 as being misdescriptive. These claims have been cancelled.

The Office rejected claim 13 as being misdescriptive because Figure 1 showed the driver circuit as being external to the display device. Figure 1 has been amended to show that the driver circuit may be internal to the display device.

Claims 8, 9, 12, 14, 15 were also rejected as being indefinite because of the technical difficulties of claims 7 and 13. Claims 8, 9, 14 and 15 have been cancelled. Claim 12 has been amended to be dependent on amended claim 11, which does not contain the difficulties mentioned.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of claims 11-12 and 17-18 should be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

The Office rejects claims 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Boerstler* (US Patent 5,870,003). Claims 7 and 13 have been cancelled.

The Office rejects claims 7-10 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Young* (US Patent 5,889,428). Claims 7-10 and 13-16 have been cancelled.

The Office rejects claims 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application (EP 0808014A2). Claims 7 and 13 have been cancelled.

***Conclusion***

Under 37 CFR 1.116, amendments may be made after a Final Office Action canceling claims or complying with requirements of form expressly set forth in the Office Action. The claims rejected over prior art have each been cancelled. The Office has not rejected claims 11-12 or 17-18 over any prior art. The rejections to these claims were under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 11-12 and 17-18 have been amended, and are believed to overcome these rejections. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the present amendment should be entered and claims 11-12 and 17-18 should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s): the withdrawal of all objections and rejections of

record; the allowance of all the pending claims; and the holding of the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Except as otherwise stated in the previous Remarks, applicants note that each of the amendments have been made to place the claims in better form for U.S. practice or to clarify the meaning of the claims; not to distinguish the claims from prior art references, otherwise narrow the scope or comply with other statutory requirements. Moreover, Applicants reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. \$1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. \$1.17.

In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact William S. Francos, Esq. (Reg. No. 38,456) at (610) 375-3513 to discuss these matters.

Appl. No. 10/023,107  
Amendment/Response  
Reply to Final Office Action of  
April 3, 2003

Page 11 of 11

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:  
Phillips Electronics North America Corp.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Will S. Francos", written in dark ink.

by: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)

Volentine Francos, PLLC  
Two Meridian Blvd.  
Wyomissing, PA 19610  
(610) 375-3513